Exhibit 16 August 14, 2020 Hearing Transcript

```
1
                   UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
                        DISTRICT OF NEVADA
     BEFORE THE HONORABLE CARLA L. BALDWIN, MAGISTRATE JUDGE
2
                             ---000---
3
                               : No. 3:18-cv-0296-MMD-CLB
4
    Tesla, Inc.,
5
                Plaintiff,
                                : August 14, 2020
6
           -vs-
7
                                : United States District Court
    Martin Tripp,
                                : 400 S. Virginia Street
8
                Defendant. : Reno, Nevada 89501
9
10
11
                   TRANSCRIPT OF MOTION HEARING
12
13
    A P P E A R A N C E S:
14
    FOR THE PLAINTIFF:
                             Alexander Spiro
                              Jeanine Zalduendo
15
                             Michael Lifrak
                              Attorneys at Law
16
    FOR THE DEFENDANT:
17
                             William Fischbach
                             Robert Mitchell
18
                             Attorneys at Law
19
    FOR THE DEFENDANT:
                            Martin Tripp
20
2.1
    CLB/FTR: 081420@7:02am
22
    Proceedings recorded by digital recording produced by
23
    computer-aided transcript
24
    Transcribed by:
                             KATHRYN M. FRENCH, RPR, CCR
25
                             NEVADA LICENSE NO. 392
                             CALIFORNIA LICENSE NO. 8536
```

```
Reno, Nevada, Friday, August 14, 2020, 7:02 a.m.
1
2
                            ---0-0---
3
                THE CLERK: The United States District Court
 4
    for the District of Nevada is now in session.
5
    Honorable Carla Baldwin presiding.
6
7
                This is the date set for a video Status
    Conference in case number 18:cv-0296-MMD-CLB, Tesla,
8
    Inc. versus Martin Tripp.
9
                Present by video on behalf of plaintiff,
10
11
    Alexander Spiro, Jeanine Zalduendo and Michael Lifrak.
12
                Present by video on behalf of defendant,
    William Fischbach, Robert Mitchell.
13
                And also present by video, Martin Tripp.
14
15
                THE COURT: Okay. Good morning, everybody.
    We are here for a Status Conference related to the
16
17
    emergency motion that was filed by Tesla, I believe day
18
    before yesterday. Let me just go around the room.
    think it would be helpful if I had everybody introduce
19
    themselves. I think this is the first time I've
20
2.1
    actually seen some of you in person.
22
                So, I'll go ahead with Tesla's attorneys.
23
    If you could just go ahead and introduce yourselves for
24
    the record, please.
25
                MR. SPIRO: Good morning, Your Honor.
                                                         This
```

```
is Alex Spiro.
1
2
                THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
3
                MR. LIFRAK: Good morning, Your Honor, this
    is Michael Lifrak.
4
5
                UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Unintelligible.)
                THE COURT: Okay. I think we have some
6
7
    people on the call, so I'm going to make it very clear
8
    to everybody that you need to put your phones on mute.
9
    If we have extensive background information and noise,
    we will be disconnecting the call.
10
11
                UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Unintelligible.)
12
                THE COURT: Okay. I'm only going to give
13
    one warning for that. So everybody understands, if
    you're on the call to listen to this hearing, if you
14
15
    continue to interrupt, we will disconnect the call.
                So, let me go ahead and turn to Mr. Tripp's
16
17
    attorneys. I believe you're sitting in a conference
    table. If you could go ahead and introduce yourselves
18
19
    please.
20
                MR. FISCHBACH: Good morning, judge.
2.1
    William Fischbach here.
22
                MR. MITCHELL: And good morning, Your Honor.
23
    Robert Mitchell.
24
                THE COURT: Okay.
25
                And Mr. Tripp, is that you, sir?
```

```
1
                MR. TRIPP:
                           Yes.
2
                THE COURT: Very nice to see you.
                                                    What time
3
    is it where you're at, sir?
 4
                MR. TRIPP:
                           4:00 p.m.
5
                THE COURT:
                           Okay. Well, I tried to set this
    at a time when it was somewhat of a decent hour for all
6
7
    of us. For those of us on the West Coast, it's a little
8
    early. But, I'm glad that we were able to get everybody
9
    here together.
10
                I'm going to go through several things
11
    because, to be honest with you, Mr. Tripp, I think
12
    there's been, um -- like they said in Cool Hand Luke,
    "sort of a failure to communicate." So, I think it's
13
    going to be important for you to, sort of, understand
14
15
    where we're at, um, for me to explain, sort of, the
16
    process of how we got to where we are today, and to
17
    go through several things because I'm not entirely
18
    confident that you either were given the information or
19
    that it was explained in a way that was understandable,
20
    and so we're going to go through several things today.
2.1
                Okay, sir?
22
                MR. TRIPP: Yes. That is fine.
23
                THE COURT: Okay.
24
                MR. TRIPP: Appreciate that.
25
                THE COURT: I will also be asking you at
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

```
several points if you have any questions or
clarifications, as I will to Tesla's counsel.
just so you know, if you have any questions and I'm
speaking with anybody else, just hold on and I will
get to you for you to follow-up.
            Okay. Is there any questions about that,
sir?
           MR. TRIPP: Uh, no, there's not.
           And I'm sorry. I'm having to mute and
unmute, so it might take me a split second to respond.
            THE COURT: No. I appreciate that.
                                                 Thank
you very much.
            Okay. So the first thing I want to talk
about is the Motion to Withdraw Counsel. Sir, one thing
to understand is that you currently have what we call,
um, counsel of record in this case.
           Now I know that there has been a disconnect
and an agreement, maybe, between you and your attorneys
that they will no longer be representing you, but for
purposes of the litigation, until the Court actually
enters an Order of Withdrawal, they remain your counsel.
And when you have an attorney, the Court speaks to your
lawyers and only your lawyers. So, with that motion to
withdraw being on file, but it hasn't been granted yet,
technically, they are still your counsel of record.
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
Okay. Is there somebody on the call that
has not muted their phone call because, again, if I have
to ask this again, we will be disconnecting the call.
Please mute your phones.
            All right. So with that being said, sir,
your attorney have filed a motion to withdraw at ECF
docket number 202. I had ordered that in our Local
Rules you actually have the ability to object or to
file an opposition to that. And I have to give you the
opportunity to do that, but I figured it might just make
sense to go ahead and cut to the chase and ask you on
the record if you have any objection to the withdrawal
of your counsel here today, sir?
            MR. TRIPP: I do not.
            THE COURT:
                       Okay.
            And let me turn to Mr. Spiro. Do you have
any objection, at this time, sir, to the withdrawal of
Mr. Fischbach and Mr. Mitchell?
            MR. SPIRO: I do not, Your Honor.
            THE COURT: Okay.
            So, I am going to grant the Motion to
Withdraw with the caveat that the attorney eyes only
documents will remain in their possession for the time
being. I will address that at a later time. But for
right now, until we have the issues around the
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

```
protective order resolved, I'm going to go ahead and
just keep the status quo as it relates to those
documents.
            So Mr. Fischbach and Mr. Mitchell, you're
welcome to stay on the call, but if you would like to
disconnect, you can go ahead and do that. You are
formally withdrawn from this case.
            UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you, judge.
I'd like to stay, if that's all right.
                        Sure. That sounds good to me.
            THE COURT:
            All right. So, moving on. We have a lot of
issues going on in this case, obviously, and there's a
lot of ways that that could be dealt with. You know, I
think that there's probably a lot of people expecting
that the Court's going to come out and be really upset
and be really angry and do a lot of things. But, that's
just not how I roll.
            So, what I would like to do before we get
into all of that is, like I said, I want to have a
discussion about some of how we got to where we're at
because, to be totally honest, Mr. Tripp, I have a
feeling that there is some, some genuine disconnect
and misunderstanding about some of the things that have
been going on in this case. Um, I will tell you that
you have -- and as I know you know -- you have violated
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

the Protective Order that's in place in this case, including an order that I entered on Monday. I have never seen anything like it. I don't think any of my colleagues have seen anything like it. But, I'll be honest with you. I can tell from what I've seen of your Twitter feed that a lot of it comes from a place of frustration. It appears to me that you're not being listened to and, most importantly, you're not being heard. And so we're going to change that today. Okay? So, let me start out with explaining how we got to where we're at with the Protective Order because I do think that there is some confusion about that. And it might even be helpful for some of Tesla's lawyers because they're new to this case as well. They weren't involved in that process. So, after this case was filed in 2018 -- and to clarify, too, I think you had mentioned something about multiple judges being on your case. There was a judge assigned to your case originally, Judge Valerie Cooke, and she retired. She didn't withdraw. retired. And so I took over. Judge Hicks, who was assigned to your case, did recuse because there was the entry of some attorneys in this case that he has a recusal issue with. And so

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

```
when he realized that they had joined the case, he
recused from that -- for that purpose. But, there
hasn't been this mass exodus from your case on purpose
or anything like that. So, just to clarify that for
you. Okay?
            So when the case first was filed, obviously,
it was assigned to Judge Cooke and then it got assigned
to me when I took the bench. And I had a Case
Management Conference, which is really just a hearing
where I talk to the lawyers about how the case is
going to proceed through discovery, depositions, um,
document disclosures, and things like that. And there
was an agreement that had been reached by your attorneys
at the time, as well as Tesla's. And one of the primary
concerns at that point was because this case emanates
from the disclosure of confidential information.
then, apparently, there was some disclosure after the
case was filed about having that happen again.
actually had a very lengthy discussion at a hearing
about what the terms of that Protective Order should
look like and how we were going to implement that.
            I think it's important to understand -- I
think, you know, I know that I can --
            (Unintelligible speaking.)
            THE COURT: Please mute your phones.
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

Lisa, if that happens again, we're going to disconnect. THE CLERK: Yes, Your Honor. THE COURT: Okav. So, at any rate, back to this, Mr. Tripp, the reality was, is that we actually thought long and hard about this. And a Protective Order is not just intended to protect Tesla. There is information that would be disclosed, potentially, about your personal information, your address, your social security number, maybe financial information, if they asked for financial information related to, for example, damages or things of that nature. And there is a protection that needs to be in place for all parties because that information should not be made publically available. It shouldn't be turned over to people that aren't part of this. And of course in this case, obviously, because Tesla has its corporate concerns, it, obviously, seems to be more for their purpose, but the reality is a Protective Order is there for all parties in the litigation. And so that order was -- once they had met agreement and I signed it, it became my Order. It was no longer just an agreement between the attorneys and yourself. It was an Order of the Court. And regardless of whether your attorneys remain in this case or not, it

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

is still an Order of the Court. If there is a request to have that altered or change because you're unhappy with what your counsel did in entering that Order, the way to address that is to file a motion and ask for that to be modified. But, it doesn't matter if your attorneys are involved or not because the Order is what it is. It is an Order of the Court. It is no longer just an agreement of the parties. So do have any questions about that, sir, or how that came to be? MR. TRIPP: No, I do not. THE COURT: Okay. So when we had our hearing earlier this week on the first emergency motion, I think there's some confusion about what the Court did, partly because you weren't here. And again, you were represented by counsel at that time. I received a motion to withdraw, I think, an hour before the hearing. So, really, I want to be clear. The Court didn't really enter any new orders. No one did anything different. All I did was reaffirm that we had the Protective Order and that there were provisions in that Protective Order that prohibited the disclosure of certain information. was no attempt to create new orders that were, you know, intended to bypass your ability to talk to the Court

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

or give your response to what you had done. To the contrary, sir, I actually rejected the notion from Tesla to just hold you in contempt and sanction you at that point. And I'm not sure if you're aware of that. So, a couple of the tweets, I know, talked about not getting due process, not being able to respond. And let me be very clear with you; that's actually not correct. What I did was reaffirm the Protective Order and then I issued an Order to Show Cause, where I specifically gave you a couple of weeks, actually, to file exactly what you feel that you need to file, which is a response, or an explanation of why you shouldn't be held in contempt and why you shouldn't be sanctioned. And instead of doing that on an emergency basis and only giving you a day or two to respond, I gave you extra time to do that because I knew you were getting rid of your attorneys, and that you were either going to represent yourself or need to find new attorneys, so it wouldn't be fair to make you do that in only a couple of days. I then gave Tesla an opportunity to respond. But, I gave you the last word. You actually have the ability to file a reply brief to whatever they file. And then I also ordered a hearing, where we were going to have witnesses and have evidence taken before

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

anything was decided about what would happen. The only reason I mention the issues of case-ending sanctions, which would be dismissals of counterclaims and things like that, was because it's important that you're on notice that all of the sanctions that are available could be so significant. If I don't put you on notice of that, then those sanctions can't be imposed and we would have to start all over and do it all over again. So for due process purposes, just so you're aware, my purpose was to make sure that you were on notice of all of the things that would be considered, and that you would have the full and fair opportunity to respond to that. So, again, I think there is some lack of clarity and maybe some confusion of what happened and, as a result of that, I think it upset you quite significantly. So, I wanted to give you an opportunity to understand that because, again, I'm not sure what was communicated to you and, more importantly, I'm just not sure what all you understood or didn't, maybe, understand from all of that.

So, does that help clarify what happened earlier this week, sir?

MR. TRIPP: It certainly does, Your Honor.

And I appreciate it. It makes much more sense than it

1 did hours ago. 2 THE COURT: Okay. All right. Well, I'm 3 glad to hear that. 4 So, the only new thing that I did enter on 5 that Order was that I asked that you not contact Tesla's 6 attorneys. And I did that for two reasons. 7 because the attorneys felt that the communications they 8 were receiving were threatening. Now whether you intended them to be threatening or not, or whether that's how you think they were intend -- or read, it's 10 11 a little irrelevant in the sense that that's how they 12 felt when they received them. So, to make sure that no one felt that way, I put that Order in place. 13 But, the second thing that I think is 14 15 important for you to understand is, again, because you were represented by counsel, the Rules of Professional 16 17 Conduct for attorneys in Nevada -- which these 18 attorneys, even if they're not from Nevada are bound by in this case -- prohibits them from talking to a 19 20 represented party. So, if they were to have to talked 2.1 to you, it would have violated their professional ethics 22 responsibilities. 23 So, to ensure that they weren't put in an 24 awkward spot, where they might be violating a rule by 25 talking to you when you're, technically, represented, my

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

ruling was just simply not to talk to you and you not make contact with them until I ruled on the Motion to Withdraw. So, that was the only real alternate decision -- or new part of any kind of Order that was entered on Monday was, really, that. And then, of course, I entered the Order to Show Cause with the time frames for responses and setting the evidentiary hearing. But in terms of the Protective Order and your ability to respond and to be able to say your side of the story, all of that was all available. And like I said, I think there was some confusion about that. And so I'm not sure how that happened, but I think that's what fueled some of the fire over the last couple of days. So, I wanted to make sure that we clarified that for you. Okay, sir? So do you have any questions about, about any of that or anything that I've just said? MR. TRIPP: No, I do not. Thank you. THE COURT: Okay. Thank you so much. Now, let's get to the skinny; why we're here today. So we're here today because, obviously, um, I think fairly clearly, and as I've already stated, you have decided to disclose information that was protected

2.1

by the Protective Order in this case in violation of my Order and, again, of my Order of Monday. And you've chosen to do that with, quite clearly, knowing the terms of those orders and recognizing that by doing so, that you may very likely will be sanctioned for that.

But, I think it's important to understand that everybody here is upset. Tesla is upset. Tesla's attorneys are upset. You are, clearly, upset. I could be upset, but, to be honest with you, I've had so many people say some of the things that said on Twitter about me before. It really doesn't affect me too much, to be honest with you. I've had so many people tell me to F' off or shove something in a dark place that, really, it doesn't affect me too much anymore. So, no worries for me. But I will get to the issues of how that impacts, legally, what's going on in this case.

But, I think it's important for you to understand from Tesla's perspective, that the reason why they're so upset, it's not just the disclosure of the documents. I think their attorneys are upset because the fact that you took to Twitter and put their names and their e-mails and their personal information, in terms of where they work, online, resulted in a lot of phone calls and e-mails. And to be honest with you, it puts people's safety at risk. Even if you don't

2.1

intend to do anything bad, you don't know what the followers that you have on Twitter might do. And in a world where we have people showing up at people's doors and shooting and doing all of these things, I think they're quite upset about that. And there was a reference to that at our hearing earlier this week, about the phone calls and the communications that they were getting because that information was put on Twitter.

And I know, from what you've said, that the reason you're disclosing this is because you want people to be safe and to know what they're doing when they're buying a Tesla, I have to think that you may not be, um, quite aware of the safety concerns that have been impacted just by what you've done. And I think it's important for you to understand why they're so upset because it's not just their information. It's also the safety issues that have now been put in place.

Now, like I said, I can tell that you're upset and I can tell that you've been through a lot.

And your frustration doesn't just emanate from the last week. It emanates all the way from the time that you were an employee with Tesla. And I -- you know, I get it. You're upset. You feel wronged. You feel, again, I think -- and I'm putting words in your mouth maybe,

2.1

but just go with me on this. I get the impression that no one has really been listening to you; that you aren't being heard; that your clients -- or your attorneys aren't really listening to what you want and how you want this case to proceed. And as a result of that, I don't know what happened over the weekend that finally blew up, but something blew up.

And so I want to take an approach with this case a little different than what most judges would do. I think most judges would simply be sitting here and talking about what kind of sanctions and what we're going to do and how we're going to make all this go away. But, I want to do something a little different today. And I'm going to ask everybody to go with me on this.

I think it makes sense for us to have a little impromptu settlement conference right now and I'm going to ask everybody if they're okay with me meeting with you privately, and meeting with Tesla privately, to discuss whether or not we should setup a settlement conference to, at the very minimum, to try to resolve the issues that are going on right now with the emergency Protective Order issues.

So, do you have any objection to that, sir?

MR. TRIPP: No, I don't.

```
1
                THE COURT:
                           Okay.
2
                Mr. Spiro.
3
                MR. SPIRO: No, Your Honor. No objection.
 4
                THE COURT:
                            Okav.
5
                So, what we're going to do is we're going
6
    to go off the record and I'm going to move everybody on
7
    will Zoom call into separate Zoom rooms, and I'm going
8
    to talk to you: And I'll talk to you privately. And
9
    we're going to talk about whether or not we can, at
    least, reach some sort of settlement or agreement on
10
11
    what the status quo is going to be in this case, or
12
    whether or not we can reach even a settlement of the
13
    case, potentially. Maybe not today, but maybe setup a
    time that we can do that.
14
15
                So the way that this normally works,
    Mr. Tripp, is I normally start with the plaintiffs in
16
17
    a case. And in this case, that is Tesla. So, I want
18
    you just to be patient with me. I'm going to spend a
19
    little time with them, but then I'm going to spend some
20
    time with you, but know that I'm going to hear you.
2.1
    going to listen to you. And I'm going to take some time
22
    today to try to figure out how we can make this right.
23
                Do you have any questions about that?
24
                MR. TRIPP: No. I appreciate that,
25
    Your Honor.
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you all so much. So, with that, we're going to go off the record and we're going to move everybody into their Zoom rooms, so just be patient with me and I'll be with you in just a moment. Mr. Fischbach and Mr. Mitchell, do you want to stick around for that or would you like to be in your own room or how do you want to roll? UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No, judge, I think it's appropriate for us to go off the call at this point. If for any reason the Court needs to reach us, both Mr. Mitchell and I are here in our office. THE COURT: Okay. Well, I want to, first off, before we get off the phone -- and I know, Mr. Tripp, you have some disagreements with your counsel, and I have said this on the record before, but I want to tell Mr. Fischbach and Mr. Mitchell, you have been consummate professionals in this case. I verv much enjoyed having you practice in front of me. Um, thank you so much for all of what you've done. You've made this case quite enjoyable in terms of -- you know, normally, attorneys, especially in a case like this and this complexity, can be very difficult with one another. And so thank you very much for the professionalism that you showed while you were working on this case.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

with that, I wish you the best. And if you're ever back in Reno, I hope you appear in front of me again. And so with that, let's get started. (Off the record.) THE CLERK: In the matter of Tesla, Inc. versus Martin Tripp, court is again in session. THE COURT: Okay. Well, I quess it's still good evening, maybe good afternoon for some of you. It's still morning here for me. But, I am pleased to announce that we did have some informal settlement discussions about the ongoing emergency motions that have been filed on behalf of Tesla related to the violations of the Protective Order in this case, and there has been an agreement that has been reached. what we're going to do at this point is we're going to put some material terms on the record related to that conclusion. So, Mr. Tripp, for the first part, what I need to do is I need to verify on the record some different factual contentions. So, Mr. Tripp, it's alleged that starting over the weekend, I believe it was on August 7, that you did begin uploading information that was, um, subject to a confidential Protective Order, and that you did that knowingly and willfully.

1 Is that correct, sir? 2 Your Honor, that is correct. MR. TRIPP: 3 THE COURT: Okay. 4 And, that you continued to do that even 5 after I entered a second Order earlier this week, where you continued to willfully and knowingly upload 6 7 information that you had been ordered not to upload 8 related to this litigation. 9 Is that correct, sir. That is correct. 10 MR. TRIPP: 11 THE COURT: And in light of that, you are 12 willing to, um, incur a sanction, um, from the Court 13 related to that, um, in terms of your knowing and willful violation of the Court's Protective Order and 14 15 its subsequent Order related to the confidentiality of certain documents. 16 17 Is that correct, sir? 18 MR. TRIPP: That is correct. 19 THE COURT: Okay. And so the -- this is 20 what you've agreed to in the follows: You've agreed 2.1 to pay \$25,000 in attorneys' fees to Tesla for the cost 22 that they had to incur to, um, either -- not only in 23 communicating with you and your counsel to have these 24 documents removed, but also in having to file motions, 25 as well as appear for hearings related to these

```
1
    violations of the Protective Order and the Court's
2
    subsequent Order.
3
                Is that correct, sir?
                MR. TRIPP: That is correct.
 4
5
                THE COURT: And that you will pay that money
    within 60 days?
6
7
                MR. TRIPP: I will try.
8
                THE COURT: Okay. And if you're unable to
9
    do that, you will contact Mr. Spiro and we will discuss
10
    how we can, uh, address that issue in 60 days time.
11
                Is that correct?
12
                MR. TRIPP: That is correct.
13
                THE COURT: Okay.
                You've also agreed that you will not
14
15
    re-upload or re-post any of this information through
    any means or mechanism; through the internet, through
16
17
    e-mails, or through any other communications. Sir,
18
    that would also include printing out copies and mailing
19
    it to anybody.
20
                So, in other words, you're agreeing not to
2.1
    disclose anything that is subject to the confidential
22
    Protective Order in this case. And should you do that
23
    or become -- anybody becomes aware of that, you will
24
    incur a $500 per day violation for, again, violating the
25
    Court's protective Order, as well as violating the terms
```

1 of this particular settlement agreement. 2 Do you understand that, sir? MR. TRIPP: Yes, I do. 3 4 THE COURT: But you will also take all 5 efforts to remove and take down any links, any postings, or any other means or mechanisms that third parties 6 7 can access these documents, uh, including whether 8 it's on any type of Cloud based storage, Google Drive, 9 PlainSite, OneDrive, that you will -- Dropbox -- you will remove any links on Facebook, Twitter or YouTube. 10 11 Um, and you will also not e-mail or otherwise make 12 these things available in any other way. And if there's 13 any sites that I did not mention, that you will take every effort to remove anything that has been improperly 14 15 uploaded at this point. 16 Do you agree to that, sir? MR. TRIPP: With the exception of PlainSite, 17 18 because I have no ability to upload or download anything 19 to or from there, I agree. 20 THE COURT: Okay. Well, to -- what I want 2.1 to make clear is that even though I might be mentioning 22 specific websites, it is not limited to those websites. 23 It's any website, or any other location where you have 24 uploaded these documents, that you're going to take 25 every effort to take them down. So, that's really more

```
of the intent of what I'm saying here.
1
2
                Do you understand that?
                MR. TRIPP: Yes, Your Honor. If I uploaded
3
    those documents, I will have them removed.
4
5
                THE COURT: Okay. All right.
                MR. TRIPP: I will remove them.
 6
7
                THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
8
                And, that within seven days, you will file a
9
    Notice of Compliance with the Court and you will detail
    all of the steps that you took to remove the documents
10
11
    from the different websites, correct?
12
                MR. TRIPP: That is correct.
13
                THE COURT:
                           Okay.
                And, also that you agree that you will
14
15
    not make anymore reference or description to anybody,
    whether it be in person, whether it be over the phone,
16
17
    whether it be an e-mail, or any other website, about
18
    "the attorney eyes only" documents that you have
    previously described, also in violation of the
19
    Protective Order.
20
2.1
                You agree to do that, correct, sir?
22
                MR. TRIPP: That's correct. I agree.
23
                THE COURT: Okay.
24
                All right. And again, that would also be
25
    subject to that $500 a day violation. So if you go on
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

```
Twitter and you print a description about a document,
that, too, will trigger that $500.
            Do you understand that, sir?
            MR. TRIPP: I do.
            THE COURT: Okay.
            All right. Do you have any questions or is
there anything about the terms that I've just put on the
record that are inaccurate or that I need to correct,
sir?
            MR. TRIPP:
                      No.
            THE COURT: Mr. Spiro?
            Oh. You're on mute.
            MR. SPIRO: Yes, Your Honor. Those terms,
uh, in terms of sanctions for the finding are, um,
permissible on our side. And we thank the Court for
it's time this morning.
            The only other thing I would just note for
the record because there was, uh, a moment of exchange
about it and I just want to make it clear, is that, um,
Mr. Tripp currently, as far as we understand, has that
amount of funds in his GoFundMe page, and we just wanted
to, since we've been discussing it this morning, just
put that on the record that we're aware of that fact.
            THE COURT: Uh, Mr. Tripp has indicated to
me that those funds are no longer available. Um, but --
```

```
so those funds have been paid out in other ways.
1
2
    but the purpose of the 60-day time frame is that if
    there is anymore money that is taken into that account,
3
    or if there is any financier behind his litigation
4
5
    costs, that he will make that payment to you.
                Okay?
6
7
                MR. SPIRO: I understand the Court.
8
                THE COURT: Okay. All right. Perfect.
9
                MR. SPIRO: Thank you.
                THE COURT: Mr. Tripp, are there any other
10
11
    questions or concerns or things that you would like to
12
    place on the record, sir, before we conclude here today?
13
                MR. TRIPP: No, Your Honor. I really
14
    appreciate your time.
15
                THE COURT: Okay. Thank you so much, sir.
                Mr. Spiro, anything on behalf of the
16
    plaintiffs?
17
18
                MR. SPIRO: No, Your Honor.
19
                THE COURT: Okay.
20
                I want to thank everybody today for their
2.1
    professionalism and for working with me and taking a
22
    little bit of an unorthodox approach to address this.
23
    appreciate all your time. I very much appreciated being
24
    able to speak with all of you.
25
                And with that, motion number 207 is granted
```

```
based on the terms that I've already placed on the
1
2
             I do make a finding that Mr. Tripp did
3
    willfully and knowingly violate the terms of the Court's
    Protective Order, as well as its subsequent Order on
4
5
    Tuesday, I believe it was August 11th, um, of this year;
6
    and that the sanctions that are being imposed pursuant
7
    to this agreement are appropriate and sufficient under
8
    Rule 37(b)(2), as well as the inherent power of the
9
    Court to enforce its own orders. And, therefore, that
10
    will be the sanction in this case.
11
                And as I've already indicated, should there
12
    be any more violations, the sanction will result in a
13
    $500 per-day violation for any additional violations
    of the Court's Protective Order.
14
15
                With that, we will be in recess.
16
                Thank you all so much and have a wonderful
17
    day.
18
                UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:
                                        Thank you.
19
                UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:
                                        Thank you.
20
2.1
            (Court Adjourned.)
22
23
2.4
25
```

